THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
1891 · FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY · 1941

ROUND TABLE

10 CENTS

PROPERTY OF THE
LIBRARY OF

A RADIO DISCUSSION OF

WHICH ROAD FOR AMERICA—

Staying Out of War or the Military Defeat of Germany?

BINGHAM · JACOBY · NYE · SCHUMAN

374th BROADCAST IN COOPERATION WITH THE NATIONAL BROADCASTING COMPANY · 162

APRIL 20, 1941

The University of Chicago

ROUND TABLE

Published weekly. 10 cents a copy; five copies, 25 cents; half-year subscription, 26 issues, one dollar. Published by the University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois. Entered as second-class matter January 3, 1939, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

No. 162

NOTE

The supplementary information contained in the footnotes to the following text, developed by staff research, is not to be considered as representing the opinions of the ROUND TABLE *speakers. Following the transcript of the broadcast are questions which readers may wish to use for analysis and discussion. It is hoped that teachers and discussion leaders may find this additional service of the* ROUND TABLE *transcript helpful in their study of the subject discussed in the broadcast.*

WHICH ROAD FOR AMERICA—

Staying Out of War or the Military Defeat of Germany?

A UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO ROUND TABLE BROADCAST*

ALFRED M. BINGHAM, Editor of *Common Sense*

NEIL H. JACOBY, Assistant Professor of Finance, University of Chicago

GERALD P. NYE, United States Senator from North Dakota

FREDERICK SCHUMAN, Woodrow Wilson Professor of Government, Williams College

*A radio discussion broadcast from Radio City, New York, over the Red Network of the National Broadcasting Company, Sunday, April 20, 1941, at 2:30 P.M., Eastern Standard Time.

The ROUND TABLE, oldest educational program continuously on the air, is broadcast entirely without a script. Subjects are chosen because of their social, political, or economic significance. The program has no "ax to grind." In the selection of speakers, the effort is to provide a balanced discussion by participants who have special competence and knowledge. The opinion of each speaker is his own and in no way involves the responsibility of either the University of Chicago or the National Broadcasting Company.

WHICH ROAD FOR AMERICA—

Staying Out of War or the Military Defeat of Germany?

●

MR. JACOBY: Whatever else we may disagree upon, I know we do agree that today America is faced with the most important decision of public policy since 1917.[1] Americans are trying to make up their minds about where they should stand in regard to this war. Many of us are confused, and I'd like to put some questions to you today that I know millions of Americans are asking themselves.

The phrase "aid short of war" is ambiguous, for we know that every step we take (and now we are talking about convoying supplies to Britain) inevitably will produce the war that we have so far said we don't want. We are playing ostrich and sticking our heads in the sand. Let's clarify the real issue.[2]

---

[1] *America's decision to enter the World War was made just a little over twenty-four years ago, on February 3, 1917, when diplomatic relations with Germany were broken. On April 6, 1917, war was declared. President Wilson signed the conscription bill on May 18, registration under the act took place on June 5, and the first American troops landed in France on June 26, but American troops did not see action until the last months of 1917.*

[2] *For previous* ROUND TABLE *discussions on the problems of American foreign policy in the war, see the transcripts of the following broad-*

Suppose we assume here that Germany cannot be defeated without the United States' participation—full participation. Suppose we assume that United States' participation will insure the defeat of Germany. I'd like to ask you, Schuman, which would you choose: staying out of war or the military defeat of Germany?

MR. SCHUMAN: My position is that the prevention of a British defeat this spring and the subsequent infliction of a total military defeat of Nazi Germany is absolutely indispensable for the future security and safety of the United States, and even for the independence of the United States, at any cost and at any sacrifice; and if this requires all-out, open, shooting war, then we must face that.[3]

---

casts: May 19, 1940: "America and the Peacemongers" (Robert Kintner, Walter Laves, and George Soule); June 9, 1940: "Have We Time to Think?" (Mortimer J. Adler, H. V. Kaltenborn, Clifton Fadiman, and the Roving Reporter); September 1, 1940: "Should America Aid Britain?" (Gerald P. Nye, Clifton Utley, and S. W. Halperin); October 6, 1940: "Will Hitler Attack America Next?" (Hugh Cole, Walter Laves, Clark Foreman); October 27, 1940: " 'Warmongers' and 'Appeasers' " (Clay Judson, Walter Laves, L. C. De Vinney); January 5, 1941: "More Aid to Britain Now?" (Philip La Follette, Clifton Utley, L. C. De Vinney); January 12, 1941: "Is This Our War?" (Burton K. Wheeler, Louis Wirth, Ralph Ingersoll); February 9, 1941: "Can the Americas Be Invaded?" (Hugh Cole, L. C. De Vinney, Major Alford Williams); March 30, 1941: Should America Convoy to Britain?" (Philip La Follette, Clifton Utley, L. C. De Vinney); and April 13, 1941: "War Aims and Peace Aims" (Maynard Krueger, T. V. Smith, W. Lloyd Warner).

[3] *For a* ROUND TABLE *discussion of the possibilities and techniques of a German invasion of the British Isles, see the discussion of "Blitzkrieg on Britain" broadcast August 25, 1940.*

MR. JACOBY: That is the interventionist's point of view. Senator Nye?

MR. NYE: Let experience be a reminder to us, gentlemen! In answer to that question: No! Participation in another war in Europe is going to mean ruination for us. We ought to remember, too, that we failed utterly the last time to accomplish the purposes we had in mind. "Stay out!" should be our watchword without any reservation whatsoever. There isn't any cause in that European struggle today that merits the shedding of one single drop of American blood. To go into that war is simply a disguised suicide for the United States.

MR. JACOBY: Bingham, your position is somewhere between that of Senator Nye and Schuman.

MR. BINGHAM: Yes. I certainly would disagree with Schuman about the relation between a German defeat and saving Britain from defeat this summer. I don't believe we can ever defeat Germany without a cost that we are wholly unwilling to pay. At the same time I disagree with Senator Nye that it is of no consequence to us whether Britain goes down. I believe we should go into the war if necessary to save Britain, but that it is so important to have a negotiated peace in which America can play a leading part that we ought to stay out of war unless it becomes completely evident that Britain will go down in defeat otherwise.

MR. JACOBY: There we have three definite shades of public opinion: the interventionist's point of view that we should go into war now (I think Schuman would even argue that we are in the war already); the non-interventionist's point of view of Senator Nye—stay out of war whatever happens; and Bingham would urge that we stay out of war unless Britain is threatened.

I would like to ask you, Schuman, what fault you find with Senator Nye's and with Bingham's position?

MR. SCHUMAN: I think Bingham is already half converted to common sense, and, in accordance with the example of Adolf Hitler, who is celebrating his fifty-second birthday today at Mount Olympus,[4] I am going to concentrate on one victim at a time; namely, Senator Nye.

The Senator was quoted in the morning press as saying that the disintegration of the British Empire was inevitable and that that should not be viewed with alarm by the United States. I find that statement simply incredible—completely incredible—and I want to ask the Senator whether he seriously believes that the Americas will not be objects of aggression by the fascist triple alliance if Britain goes down to defeat, and if he seriously believes that America alone can defend herself completely surrounded by a world of enemies.

MR. NYE: Schuman, you are at once adopting the old theory that empires were born to live forever, and we know that none has yet endured forever. We should have known that the time would come ultimately for the end of the British Empire; but if that end does come now I see no serious reason for us to be particularly fearful of any attack from abroad. Certainly not nearly so fearful of that as of wasting ourselves in a war thousands of miles away from home.

MR. BINGHAM: But what about the possibility, not of an attack by Germany, but of the disintegration of our own democracy and of our own institutions in a world otherwise completely controlled by the totalitarians?

MR. NYE: It seems to me that we ought to be awakening more quickly than we have been to the fact that we'd better be getting

---

[4] *Nazi troops seized the Mount Olympus region in northern Greece on April 19. Chancellor Hitler was reported to have spent his birthday —April 20—at field headquarters there.*

our own house in order; in the kind of order that will enable us better to resist these propagandas and approaches from abroad.

MR. JACOBY: Yes. After all, if we are a push-over for Hitler's propaganda it is because we failed dismally to solve certain problems in our own economy—for instance, the problem of unemployment. Before embarking upon an expedition to spread the four freedoms[5] to the four winds perhaps we ought to try to establish them firmly here.

MR. SCHUMAN: Now, Jacoby, you are assuming that we are living in a world which is not a united world and which is not a world-society and a world-economy. That seems to me to be completely contrary to the most elemental facts in the world in which we live. I don't see why the Senator refers to this as a European war. This is a world war for mastery of the planet—America included.

MR. NYE: Who has said that this war was for the determination of who should rule the planet?

MR. SCHUMAN: Mr. Hitler, Emperor Hirohito, and Benito Mussolini, who signed a treaty on the seventeenth of last September at Berlin—the Triple Alliance pact in which they agreed to give one another full aid and cooperation in a new world-order.

MR. NYE: What's that got to do with dominating the whole world or giving any warning or any declaration of warning to the United States that it might expect attack from them?

MR. JACOBY: After all, supposing Hitler and Emperor Hirohito and Mussolini say they want to dominate the world; the *expression* of the desire and the *accomplishment* of that desire are two different things.

---

[5] *The "four freedoms" refer to the phrases "freedom from want, freedom to worship, freedom to speak, freedom from fear," used in a speech delivered last winter by President Roosevelt.*

MR. BINGHAM: Do you want *us* to dominate the world, Schuman?

MR. SCHUMAN: If we have to choose (and we may ultimately have to choose) between domination of the world by the United States and the British Commonwealth of Nations or domination of the world by Adolf Hitler and his allies, I don't see how any American can hesitate a moment as to what that choice ought to be.

MR. BINGHAM: Are those the only two choices?

MR. SCHUMAN: In the long run those seem to me to be the only two choices we have before us. I cannot see any middle ground between those two.

MR. JACOBY: In discussing this question of staying out of war or of assuring a military defeat of Germany, surely we must weigh the issue from the standpoint of what it would cost to insure a German military defeat. Surely you would not argue that any cost —the utter disintegration of our society—would make it worth while.

MR. SCHUMAN: I assuredly would, because I insist that a Nazi victory would mean the utter disintegration of our society, and, therefore, there is nothing to choose between. I would not agree that the cost of bringing Nazi Germany to defeat involves any such disintegration.

MR. BINGHAM: But Europe is a continent of 300,000,000 people, organized by the most efficient despotism the world has ever seen, and is thousands of miles from our shores. The notion that we can cross the Atlantic and defeat that powerful despotism seems to me utterly fantastic, and it would ruin not only America but the last hope of a decent civilization if we should attempt it.

MR. SCHUMAN: I agree with you that it is going to be a lot easier, in the event Britain goes down, for the Nazis to come into the Western Hemisphere and dominate Latin America and render us helpless than it is going to be for us to defeat Nazi Germany; but I would add this: Bismarck[6] once said, "Politics is the art of what is possible," and Hitler has amended that to say, "Politics is the art of the impossible." If we as a people, as a republic, as a nation, as a citadel of freedom, are incapable of doing this job, or less capable of performing the miracles the Nazis have performed, then we haven't any future anyway.

MR. BINGHAM: But that performance of miracles is a performance of miracles in military strategy, military power, and military might, which certainly is not the genius of the American people. Wouldn't you agree with that, Senator Nye?

MR. NYE: Oh, definitely! I have to agree with that. It seems to me we have let hysteria carry us a long way away from what is our obligation—our first obligation.

MR. SCHUMAN: That is exactly what Neville Chamberlain said to the British people: that hysteria was calling them to the defense of Czechoslovakia and that they ought to banish the thought.[7]

---

[6] *Prince von Bismarck (1815–1898) is most often credited with being the moving spirit behind German unity in the nineteenth century. He became Prussian chancellor in 1867 and was the first chancellor of the German Empire. He remained in this post until differences of opinion with Wilhelm II caused his dismissal in 1890.*

[7] *Neville Chamberlain, recent British premier, who succeeded Stanley Baldwin as prime minister in 1937, was replaced in the spring of 1940 (after British failures in Norway, and just at the time of the invasion of the low countries) by Winston Churchill, present premier. Chamberlain died last year.*

MR. NYE: Yes, and in spite of that warning England and France went ahead and declared a war that they insisted they did not want and were afraid of.

MR. JACOBY: Let us come back to this main question: What will it cost us to insure a German military defeat?

MR. SCHUMAN: Three to one superiority in tanks and planes.

MR. BINGHAM: How long will it take?

MR. SCHUMAN: Two or three years.

MR. BINGHAM: Twenty or thirty years!

MR. NYE: It seems to me that the President and Knudsen down in Washington are in need of our friend Schuman if he says that can be accomplished in two years' time.[8]

MR. SCHUMAN: Senator, I am not posing here as a military expert at all. I am only giving a layman's guess. But I would say this: war, as Clemenceau once observed,[9] is far too important

---

[8] *For* ROUND TABLE *discussions of the problems of armament, see the transcripts of the following broadcasts: June 23, 1940: "America's Capacity to Arm" (Royal F. Munger, A. J. Palmer, and Neil Jacoby); July 14, 1940: "M-Day and America" (Quincy Howe, Leo M. Cherne, and Herbert Heaton); December 15, 1940: "Where Are Those 50,000 Planes?" (Paul Hoffman, I. F. Stone, Neil Jacoby, Harold Vance); January 26, 1941: "Can Capitalism Defend America?" (Maynard Krueger, William H. Spencer, T. O. Yntema, and the Roving Reporter); February 16, 1941: "Guns or Butter?" (Leo M. Cherne, Harry Gideonse, Robert Nathan); and March 23, 1941: "Defense Economics" (Harold S. Moulton, Sumner Slichter, Leo M. Cherne).*

[9] *Georges Clemenceau (1841–1929) was a French politician and statesman, active from the early seventies until after the World War. He was a member of the Chamber of Deputies from 1876 to 1893 and of*

a matter to entrust only to the military experts, and if we think of this job as a job only in terms of tanks and planes and mechanics we are making a grave mistake. Hitler does not fight his wars with those weapons, but with ideas, and if we are so poverty-stricken of ideas and hope and vision for the world, of course we will lose.

MR. JACOBY: Wait a minute! Let us remember that if Germany should capture the Suez and Northern Africa, the cotton and wheat and oil that are contained within those regions would then be under her dominion, and economists tell us it would very likely be possible for that region to live by itself without any deficiencies of major materials. In other words, the British blockade would be ineffective and we might have the possibility of a great stalemate; that is, a situation where neither side could prevail upon the other.

MR. BINGHAM: I think we are in that situation now.

MR. JACOBY: Excepting that the Mediterranean has not yet been conquered.

MR. BINGHAM: But I don't believe the British blockade is effective today. I believe that Germany is substantially self-sustaining.

---

the Senate from 1902 until the end of the war. He first became prime minister in 1906, resigning in 1909 after having led the fight for the passing of laws for the separation of church and state. In November, 1917, he was again named premier and carried on the prosecution of the war with full vigor. During the peace negotiations he was a firm adherent of the extreme anti-German position, perhaps a reflection of the influence of the radical Republican leader Thaddeus Stevens in this country, whom Clemenceau knew and admired during a period spent in this country as a newspaper correspondent during the Civil War and reconstruction period.

MR. JACOBY: The French are starving.

MR. BINGHAM: The French are, but not the Germans.

MR. JACOBY: They will starve later.

MR. SCHUMAN: It seems to me that, if you are going to postulate a German victory in the battle of Egypt, and if you are going to postulate continued Germany victory in the battle of the Atlantic, we'd better talk about a complete British defeat and surrender this summer and not talk about a stalemate or anything of that sort.

MR. JACOBY: That presumes that a decision in the Mediterranean action would decide the whole war, and I can't agree. I can't see clearly that a British defeat in the Mediterranean means that Britain is defeated entirely.

MR. SCHUMAN: Both battles—in the Mediterranean and the Atlantic—are being lost at the moment. If they are both lost at the end, Britain is through.

MR. NYE: I think we are lacking in the kind of evidence that lets us conclude that those battles are lost; that the battle of the Atlantic is lost. The thing we must be more mindful of, it seems to me, is not so much what is the need of Britain and what is the need of Europe but what is going to be the need of America if we let ourselves be wasted in that struggle today.

MR. BINGHAM: Senator, that is where I disagree with you, even though I might be more on the isolationist than on the interventionist side. I cannot conceive of the isolation of this hemisphere or the hope of maintaining our democracy if all of the rest of the world becomes subject to the Axis.

MR. NYE: You are going to find that we are going to be more or less isolated and dependent upon ourselves whatever is the final result in Europe.

MR. SCHUMAN: Senator, aren't you overlooking the fact that the Congress of the United States by a large majority (and the people of the United States) have already made what seems to me to be the crucial decision? The lend-lease bill was passed in the middle of March.[10] The lend-lease bill says as clearly as any legislation can that we as a nation are committed to aid to Britain, which means that we are committed to German defeat. We have made our decision.

MR. NYE: Overwhelming is the majority of the members of Congress who will insist that in enacting the lend-lease bill they did anything but commit the United States to ultimate entry into this war; in fact, the contrary was true.

MR. JACOBY: I think the public definitely feels that we have not yet definitely committed ourselves to war. They are thinking of war in terms of shooting; thinking of ships and the building and equipping of an American expeditionary force.

MR. BINGHAM: I think we have committed ourselves to saving Britain from defeat, but not to the defeat of Germany, and there is all the difference in the world between that and preventing a British defeat.

MR. JACOBY: I disagree. I beg your pardon! I think what we have done is to commit ourselves to make arms and to ship them to Britain. We haven't said we will prevent British defeat thereby. We can't guarantee that.

MR. SCHUMAN: Is it your idea, Senator, that we have com-

---

[10] *H. R. 1776—the so-called "lend-lease" bill—was signed by President Roosevelt on March 11, 1941, and about $7,000,000,000 was voted during the following weeks as an appropriation to implement the measure.*

mitted ourselves to making arms and shipping them to the bottom of the Atlantic Ocean?

MR. NYE: We have done nothing more than that, if you want the answer in direct language.

MR. BINGHAM: I believe public opinion has demonstrated that it wants that aid to go all the way necessary to save Britain, even if it means war. In other words, at the risk of war.

MR. NYE: I'd have to differ violently with you on that score. I believe the polls, and the sentiment you contact on the street, clearly reveal that the American people are absolutely not ready even to go to the extent of convoying the delivery of the goods that we are producing under the aid-to-Britain program.[11]

MR. SCHUMAN: It is quite true, Senator, that the latest Gallup poll shows that two-thirds of the Americans are still opposed to any use of American war vessels for convoy purposes. My position

---

[11] *The most recent Gallup report (March 21, 1941) showed 83 per cent of the American people would vote against America entering the war against Germany, 17 per cent would vote in favor. The Gallup report on April 6, 1941, indicated that 67 per cent of the people thought it more important to help Britain, even "at the risk of getting into the war," than to "stay out of the war." The Gallup release of April 20 gave the following figures on American attitudes toward sending*

a) A part of the army to help Britain	*17% Yes*
	79% No
	4% Undecided
b) A part of the air force, with American pilots	*24% Yes*
	69% No
	7% Undecided
c) Some warships, with American sailors	*27% Yes*
	67% No
	6% Undecided

would be that if a majority of our citizens is irrevocably converted to that position we are lost. Our honor is lost because . . . .

MR. NYE: I think that was the theory of those who were leading the cause of the lend-lease program. Down in their hearts they knew what the next step would be, but they never admitted it. The great majority of Congress was very pronounced in its expression of determination that we were not going any further in a way that would involve us in war than we were in this lend-lease bill.

MR. JACOBY: In other words, the public still feels that we have a decision to make.

Bingham, you suggested a third alternative: that we did not merely have the choice of staying out of war or going in and assuring a military defeat of Germany if we could, but that a negotiated peace might offer a favorable alternative. What are your notions about the possibilities of negotiating with Hitler and the terms of such a peace?

MR. BINGHAM: Schuman mentioned a moment ago that this is not merely a war of machine guns and tanks, but a war of ideas and objectives. I am convinced that if we show the rest of the world, and show Germany, and show the whole conquered Continent of Europe that we are ready to help build a new world-order that is not Hitler's world-order, thereupon a completely new situation will arise throughout Germany and Europe, provided, of course, Germany is convinced she cannot actually invade and conquer Britain. At that point the possibility of negotiation will become real and we can bring even Germany to the give-and-take attitude that is an essential of negotiation.

MR. NYE: In that event, then, aren't we in a much stronger position to lend our influence and determine the future so far as the world is concerned if we keep ourselves free from that war than we would be if we joined our lot with the belligerents now involved?

MR. BINGHAM: Absolutely! But I would not think that we were preparing ourselves properly if we took such an isolationist attitude that we thought we could survive as a civilization apart from the rest of the world. A part of our attitude and a part of our preparation must be for a negotiated peace.

MR. NYE: Why do you say that we could not live, if we had to, apart from the rest of the world in view of the fact that in recent years our economic dependence upon foreign trade has amounted to a total of only 3 per cent?[12]

MR. BINGHAM: Because, as Schuman said, this is a world tied together economically, socially, culturally, and spiritually.

MR. JACOBY: I would deny that! It seems to me it can be proved that there are a number of areas in the world which can live by themselves, more or less. I am not saying that is a desirable thing (I think it is not), but to say that we cannot live in isolation seems to me to belittle the facts in the case.

MR. SCHUMAN: I was glad to hear Bingham say a few moments ago that he was sure a new world-order was a prerequisite of any possible negotiated peace with Germany. That, of course, is the position of Clarence Streit,[13] who has urged union now with Britain as

---

[12] *American foreign trade in recent years (in millions of dollars) has totaled as follows:*

Year	*Exports*	*Imports*	*Total*
1940	*$4,022*	*$2,625*	*$6,647*
1939	*3,177*	*2,318*	*5,495*
1938	*3,094*	*1,960*	*5,054*

[13] *Clarence Streit, former journalist, now active in urging a union of the United States and the British Empire, is the author of "Union Now" and "Union Now with Britain."*

the only possible basis either of winning the war, if a proposal for negotiated peace is rejected, or as a basis for protecting the building of a new world-order if there is acceptance.

MR. NYE: May I suggest that "suicide now" rather than "union now" is a more descriptive term?

MR. SCHUMAN: Why do you call it "suicide," Senator?

MR. NYE: Because if we undertake any such union we are tying up with a dead horse; we are inviting obligations to ourselves that never before have been ours; we are simply putting our neck out as we have never done before.

MR. SCHUMAN: I disagree with you! I think we are simply taking cognizance of a fact which many Americans have been unwilling to face but which they will have to face now; namely, that British naval power and British domination of the great seaways has for a century been the only thing which has given security to the Western Hemisphere and to Latin America. If that fleet goes down, we are in helpless isolation, because our two-ocean navy cannot possibly be completed before 1946.

MR. NYE: And Mr. Hitler, or any one else, cannot begin even to think of any proposition of action over in this hemisphere by 1946 or 1950!

MR. SCHUMAN: Mr. Hitler will be very gracious if he will refrain from thinking of his plans of aggression in the Western Hemisphere.

MR. NYE: He is going to have to be gracious by reason of the headaches he is going to have to deal with there at his very door.

MR. SCHUMAN: His headaches will be in South America, and they will be *our* headaches rather than his!

MR. NYE: When he gets into South America he is a lot farther away from us than he is when he stays in Berlin!

MR. SCHUMAN: Might I ask you, Senator, are you in favor of defense of Rio and Buenos Aires, let us say, by the United States Navy?

MR. NYE: I think, so far as it lies within our ability to do so, we must provide against a possible invasion anywhere on this hemisphere: North, Central, or South America. I don't know whether we can do it.

MR. JACOBY: Would you say that we should have to defend all the northern part of South America, at least those strategic portions near the Panama Canal?[14]

MR. NYE: Most decidedly!

MR. SCHUMAN: Senator, you say you don't know whether we will be able to do it. Do you think it will be easier to do after the British fleet is gone or more difficult to do?

MR. NYE: It is going to be more difficult to do.

MR. SCHUMAN: And if we fail to do it, what sort of picture of our future do you have in mind?

MR. NYE: I think then we have got the problem of dealing with a proposition such as will prevail if Great Britain again dominates as a result of this war—that is, is victorious.

MR. BINGHAM: At that point you say "if Britain dominates."

---

[14] *For further discussion of these points see the* ROUND TABLE *broadcasts "Can Germany Conquer Latin America?" (September 15, 1940, with Irving Pflaum, J. Fred Rippy, and Walter Laves) and "Can the Americas Be Invaded?" (January 26, 1941, with Hugh Cole, L. C. De Vinney, and Major Alford Williams).*

It seems to me that the new world-order that Schuman wants is a world-order based likewise on force; upon a complete domination of the rest of the world by two countries, and yet he calls that the kind of a spirit and the kind of a new world-order that will bring about a defeat of Germany.

MR. NYE: While in fact it is only an invitation to more war.

MR. SCHUMAN: Bingham, I will have to dissent very sharply! Neither Clarence Streit nor any other advocate of federal union at any time has suggested that Britain and the United States impose their will by force over all the world.

MR. JACOBY: Wait a minute! How has the world ever been united before except by force? I think that is a question that people are asking.

MR. SCHUMAN: If you are going to proceed on the long outworn assumption that law and peace can be maintained in the world without an effective central authority, then I should say you are living in a wonderland.

MR. JACOBY: You are calling force by a nice three-dollar phrase.

MR. SCHUMAN: No, no! I was going to defend the proposition of "Union Now," which does not involve at all what Bingham said it involved. It involves a Federal Union of the United States of America and the British Commonwealth of Nations to defeat Germany if Germany refuses the peace, and accept the peace if Germany accepts the peace, and invite other nations voluntarily to join if they like and leave them free not to join if they choose not to join. That is all there is in the proposition.

MR. JACOBY: We are going to discuss "Union Now" at a

later broadcast on this University of Chicago ROUND TABLE, so let's leave that out for the moment.

MR. SCHUMAN: Good!

MR. JACOBY: There is one point I'd like to make, however. The interventionists have argued for some time that if Hitler wins we will be burdened with armaments for many years to come in order to protect ourselves, and if Hitler does not win we will not have that burden. Now if seems that even if Britain wins—with our aid or without it—we shall have to maintain armed forces in various parts of the world in order to police the peace; to see that the objectives are carried out, as they were not, apparently, in the last war.

MR. NYE: Under that theory, of course, it follows that we are going to have to contribute to a larger police force—to police the world—than we have ever contributed to in the past.

MR. SCHUMAN: If we are not willing to police the world, I assure you that Adolf Hitler is quite willing to police the world—including us!

MR. NYE: There is definitely a large question of how long he can continue policing even his part of the world.

MR. SCHUMAN: There is no question of that in my mind as long as we keep on acting as we have been acting for the last ten years.

MR. JACOBY: In discussing "Which Road for America?" there is another question in many people's minds: How would these problems of trade and of distribution of raw materials be solved under a Nazi peace as opposed to a British-American peace?

MR. NYE: Certainly we would have to adapt ourselves to any new theories, any new economies, developed anywhere in the world. We have had to do that before; it isn't beyond us to do it again, and

we don't have to make America Fascist or Nazi in order to hold our own in that kind of a world.

MR. BINGHAM: Senator, I believe that in adapting ourselves to a world dominated by the Nazis we would have to do more than adapt ourselves. We would have to imitate them. I cannot see any possibility of maintaining the democratic spirit if the rest of the world is completely dominated by the Nazi spirit.

MR. NYE: Once again you are operating on the theory that our relations with the world are factors determining our prosperity and our success in America.

MR. SCHUMAN: And our independence!

MR. NYE: I don't think it plays that part at all.

MR. JACOBY: I would not go that far, Schuman.

MR. BINGHAM: I would like to discuss the importance of negotiating with undefeated nations as the only basis upon which you can begin to build a new world-order. The notion that we can go on from the present sorry state of the world to a new state of the world based on force and the dominance of a new group of powers seems to me to forget all the lessons of the past. The only decent world-order will be one based on a community of equals, and the only beginning of such a new world is a negotiated peace.

MR. NYE: I want to thank you for that expression.

MR. SCHUMAN: Senator, we are really arriving at some agreement here. I too want to thank you, Bingham, for that expression.

MR. JACOBY: It is too bad that we are agreeing! But there is one additional point to mention. We have been discussing these issues in long-run terms. "Which Road for America?" is a question which must be decided now. What should America do: stay out of

war or assist in a military defeat of Germany? Will each of you sum up your position on this important question in one sentence?

MR. SCHUMAN: There is no future for America if Britain is defeated this spring, and the need is urgent. America should first inform Tokyo that if there is any Japanese "stab-in-the-back" in Singapore or in the East Indies America will fight. Secondly, America should pool its merchant shipping with Britain merchant shipping and help win the battle of the Atlantic. Thirdly, American war vessels should be ordered into convoy action immediately in both the Atlantic and the Mediterranean in order that we may have an ultimate chance of survival and an ultimate chance of defeating the Third Reich.

MR. JACOBY: What would you say, Senator?

MR. NYE: The gentleman's offer is a plain invitation to suicide. Instead of that, we must learn more largely to mind our own business, make ourselves strong in our own defense and ready for the worst that might come out of Europe to be directed against us, and to control more largely than we have been doing our hates and our fears and bring under control this hysteria that has us (really, gentlemen) making monkeys of ourselves. We must devote more thinking, more planning, to America, and less to those portions of the world engaged in their habitual game of war.

MR. SCHUMAN: Senator, you have just stated the formula for suicide which the European democracies have employed consistently for the last five years.

MR. BINGHAM: I would continue our aid to Britain, but I would not agree with Senator Nye that we can face the possibility of British defeat with impunity. I would agree with Schuman that America has no future if Britain is defeated. Therefore, our policy

must be "aid short of war" as long as we believe it possible to prevent a British defeat by measures short of war. At the same time we should face the fact that only a negotiated peace is a logical aim, and not a German defeat, which is impossible.

MR. JACOBY: Our discussion brings into sharp focus the different points of view regarding America's position in the war that are now found in every part of our land. All Americans agree, I think, that our paramount objective is to defend our country. They disagree only on the best means of achieving that end. But let us ever bear this fact in mind: nations do not go to war out of gratitude or friendship for other nations. In that I agree with Senator Nye: They fight to defend themselves and their interests.

Is it to the interest of the United States of America to get into this war? We must decide that issue soon and decide it finally. In answering the question: "Which Road for America—Stay Out of War or a Military Defeat of Germany?" let us try to weigh all of these complex factors carefully and honestly.

SUGGESTED READINGS

HUTCHINS, ROBERT M., "America and the War," *Scribner's Commentator*, April, 1941. *A plea for non-intervention in the European war and a development of the thesis that America's job is building American democracy at home.*

"If America Stands Alone," *New Republic*, March 17, 1941. *The perils of the position of the United States if it becomes isolated and encircled by the Axis.*

LINDBERGH, CHARLES A., "Letter to Americans," *Collier's*, March 29, 1941. *A statement of the non-interventionist argument by one of its most distinguished American adherents.*

LIPPMANN, WALTER, "The Atlantic and America," *Life*, April 7, 1941. *The conditions of past and possible future interventions of America in Europe explained in terms of control of the Atlantic.*

"Two Worlds," *Nation*, March 22, 1941. *A special supplement containing eight articles by such authorities as Walter Millis, Konrad Heiden, Harold Laski, and Alvarez del Vayo, speculating upon the state of the world in the event of a Hitler victory and in the event of a Hitler defeat, with some attention to what these events would mean to America.*

"Zero Hour," *Fortune*, April, 1941. *A statement of the choices of war and peace, of intervention or non-intervention in the present conflict, now facing America.*

UTLEY, CLIFTON M.; LA FOLLETTE, PHILIP F.; and DE VINNEY, L. C., *Should America Convoy to Britain?* A University of Chicago ROUND TABLE broadcast, March 30, 1941. *The issue of war and peace as it is related to the convoy issue.*

OBJECTIVE QUESTIONS FOR EXAMINATION

The answers to the following questions may be found in the text of the broadcast, and page references are provided to assist in locating the answers.

*

1. Summarize the positions of Professor Schuman, Senator Nye, and Mr. Bingham on the issue of staying out of war or insuring a military defeat of Germany. Pages 3–4.
2. The "triple alliance pact" (to which reference is made in the discussion) was signed by whom? Where? When? Page 6.
3. The cost of insuring a military defeat of Germany would amount to what, in the estimation of Professor Schuman? Page 9.
4. This cost could be accounted for in what time? What period of time is suggested by Mr. Bingham? Page 9.
5. The German conquests of what regions might, it is suggested, bring sufficient cotton, wheat, and oil to Germany to make "the new order" self-sufficient? Page 10.
6. What legislation, enacted by Congress in March, is cited as an example of "America's decision"? Page 12.
7. What is the Gallup poll estimate of the percentage of Americans who want, and Americans who don't want, convoys to Britain? Page 13.
8. According to Senator Nye, the United States is dependent upon foreign trade to what extent? Page 15.
9. Summarize the proposals of action for America which Senator Nye, Professor Schuman, and Mr. Bingham urge? Pages 21–22.

QUESTIONS FOR ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The following questions of wider scope, intended for discussion, are suggested by the broadcast, and answers may be found in the literature on the subject listed in the section "Suggested Readings," found on page 23.

*

1. Take one side of the argument whether to stay out of war or insure a military defeat of Germany. Build a case for your side upon arguments advanced by the ROUND TABLE participants. What additional points would you include in your argument?
2. Comment on the statement: "Aid short of war is ambiguous, for we know every step we take inevitably will produce the war that we have so far said we don't want." Do you agree or disagree? Discuss.
3. What do you believe to be the chances of securing a negotiated peace between Britain and the Axis? Do you think America should take any part in the promotion of such a peace? Indicate some of the problems and questions raised by a proposal of negotiation for peace and how you think they might defeat, or make possible, the goal of peace.
4. Discuss the pros and cons of the thesis that the present fighting in Europe is merely a stage in a war for mastery of the planet. What evidence can you cite for or against such a contention?
5. "Military strategy, military power, and military might .... (are) not the genius of the American people." Do you agree with this statement? Discuss.
6. Do you believe "hysteria" has gripped America? If so, define the kind of hysteria you mean, what you think it is doing to the American people, and what is being done to discourage or encourage this condition. If not, do you feel there is danger of such "hysteria" developing? Discuss.

The Listeners' Round Table . . . .

Letters to the ROUND TABLE *frequently contain interesting and illuminating comments on the subject matter discussed on the air. These excerpts are from letters received following the broadcast discussion of "War Aims and Peace Aims" April 13, 1941.*

*

Second Best

The world is sadly in need of some peace aims, particularly some practical ones. If we are ever to have an enduring peace, people the world over must face the fact that peace does not mean having everything your own way. It does mean an extension of democracy, but not an extension in the idealistic terms in which Wilson planned—the complete sovereignty and autonomy of small nations. It means the extension of the practical democratic principle of compromise. Nations must learn to live as individuals do in the United States; they must give up what appears to them as a present, personal best and accept a second best for the sake of peace.

J. G., Michigan

*

Warmongers

We think that it is not a choice between Hitler or British victory, but a decision whether these United States are and shall be governed by the people or by warmongers and capitalists who have investments in foreign countries.

(Unsigned)

Freedom

I listened to your ROUND TABLE discussion yesterday. Some of you were arguing in favor of England, and it sounded like if England is defeated then the world is at an end. If this country is so strong for England why in the world did it fight for its independence from England?

All nations on earth are entitled to share free and equally on the high seas, and that is just what Germany and Italy are fighting for. Why should the United States resist the destruction of the biggest aggressor in the world and the worst tyranny in the world, England?

Hitler is fighting for the German people and the "German Reich." Who is fighting for the American people of the United States?

J. R. L., North Dakota

*

Union Now

Thank you so very much for your presentation of Union with Britain as a possible peace basis in this present war. I feel that this is one of the only workable plans for the future and it should be stressed at this time.

S. T. B., Pennsylvania

Democracy?

I listened today to .... the ROUND TABLE, and I am infuriated at the two professors aside from Professor Krueger who wish to implicate us in this war to the extent of declaring war when we aren't even prepared to defend our ownselves not alone taking up Britain's battle..... Do you silly minded British supporters think you can work Americans into believing they are working solely for democracy when England has had her lords, dukes, and kings and luxury palaces while the common people lived in the worst slums, and the mines of Wales are the worst in the world? Yugoslavia has a king now and Turkey has had a dictator—where is the reasoning there? I thought a democracy didn't have a king or dictator. Why should we go in and fight alongside dictators and kings to save their governments .... ?

P. W. M., Florida

Smugness

When men with access to facts appear unable to keep up with the world, one is likely to despair for the rest unless able to believe in the fundamental rightness of feeling of ordinary people while recognizing that informed men can be limited by preconceptions. I hope that you (Krueger) can find a way to blast them out of their smugness; several times in today's discussion Mr. Warner demonstrated that he did not know what you were talking about by terming your argument incomprehensible.

I hoped that you would point out that T. V. Smith's cultural autonomy within politico-economic federation is becoming a fact among the Soviet Socialist Republics while it has been greatly restricted by the English in India.

H. H., Illinois

ROUND TABLE SUBSCRIPTION ORDER FORM

Please send the University of Chicago ROUND TABLE for:

☐ One Year ($2.00) ☐ Six Months ($1.00)

Name.....

Address.....

City.....State.....

☐ I am enclosing the correct amount

☐ Please send me a bill

FOREIGN: ONE YEAR, $3.00; SIX MONTHS, $1.50

TRANSCRIPT SUBSCRIPTIONS

ONE YEAR'S SUBSCRIPTION.....$2.00 SIX MONTHS'.....$1.00

FOR SINGLE COPIES OF THE BROADCASTS LISTED BELOW SEND TEN CENTS IN COIN TO THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO ROUND TABLE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. ANY FIVE PAST OR FUTURE BROADCASTS, 25 CENTS.

LISTS

OF 1938–39 TRANSCRIPTS STILL IN PRINT WILL BE SENT UPON REQUEST. STUDENTS AND TEACHERS WILL FIND THESE ISSUES TO BE VALUABLE COMMENTARIES UPON EVENTS OF THE PERIOD.

Nos.

1940

98. *The Jews*
100. *Is Russia Losing in Finland?*
101. *Tariff Walls*
102. *War Myths*
104. *Is America's Economic Frontier Closed?*
105. *Must the World Unite?*
106. *Can We Protect America?*
108. *The Archbishops Look at America*
109. *Scandinavia on the Spot*
111. *Where's That War Boom?*
112. *The Trojan Horse*
113. *Blitzkrieg, May, 1940*
114. *America and the Peacemongers*
115. *Babies Cost Money*
117. *Have We Time to Think?*
118. *Italy Marches.* (June 16, 1940)
119. *America's Capacity to Arm*
120. *Economic Union for the Americas*
121. *Civil Liberties and the Fifth Column*
122. *M-Day and America*
124. *Should America Conscript Men Now?*
125. *The New France*
126. *What Really Happened at Havana?*
128. *Blitzkrieg on Britain*
129. *Should America Aid Britain?*

Nos.

130. *Should America Feed Europe?*
131. *Can Germany Conquer Latin America?*
132. *Conscript Wealth, Too?*
134. *Will Hitler Attack America Next?*
137. *Warmongers and Appeasers*
138. *Polls and the Election*
140. *World Revolution*
141. *Art and Our Warring World*
142. *The Soviet Union and America*
143. *Is Hitler Revolutionizing Britain?*
144. *Where Are Those 50,000 Planes?*
146. *1951: The Next Decade in Education*

1941

147. *More Aid to Britain Now?*
148. *Is This Our War?*
149. *Morale: First Line of Defense?*
150. *Can Capitalism Defend America?*
152. *Can the Americas Be Invaded?*
153. *Guns or Butter?*
154. *Dilemma in the Far East*
155. *How to Fight Nazi Propaganda*
156. *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*
157. *Strikes and National Defense*
158. *Defense Economics*
159. *Should America Convoy to Britain?*
160. *Balkan Blitzkrieg*
161. *War Aims and Peace Aims.* April 13

ALL ROUND TABLE TRANSCRIPTS CONTAIN ADDED FACTUAL MATERIAL IN THE FORM OF GRAPHS, MAPS, PICTOGRAPHS, FOOTNOTES, BIBLIOGRAPHIES, ETC.

TIME CHANGES

2:30 P.M. EASTERN DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

City	*Call Letters*	*Kilocycles*	*City*	*Call Letters*	*Kilocycles*
Boston, Mass.	WNAC	1260	Portland, Me.	WCSH	970
Buffalo, N.Y.	WBEN	930	Providence, R.I.	WJAR	920
New York, N.Y.	WEAF	660	Rochester, N.Y.	WHAM	1180
Philadelphia, Pa.	KYW	1060	Schenectady, N.Y.	WGY	810
Pittsburgh, Pa.	WCAE	1250	Wilmington, Del.	WDEL	1150

1:30 P.M. EASTERN STANDARD TIME

Allentown, Pa.	WSAN	1470	Jacksonville, Fla.	WJAX	930
Altoona, Pa.	WFBG	1340	Johnstown, Pa.	WJAC	1400
Asheville, N.C.	WISE	1400	Lakeland, Fla.	WLAK	1340
Atlanta, Ga.	WSB	750	Lima, Ohio	WLOK	1240
Baltimore, Md.	WFBR	1300	Miami, Fla.	WIOD	610
Charleston, S.C.	WTMA	1250	Nashville, Tenn.	WSM	650
Charlotte, N.C.	WSOC	1240	Norfolk, Va.	WTAR	790
Cincinnati, Ohio	WSAI	1360	Raleigh, N.C.	WPTF	680
Cleveland, Ohio	WTAM	1100	Richmond, Va.	WMBG	1380
Columbia, S.C.	WIS	560	Savannah, Ga.	WSAV	1340
Columbus, Ohio	WCOL	1230	Springfield, Ohio	WIZE	1340
Dayton, Ohio	WING	1410	Tampa, Fla.	WFLA	970
Detroit, Mich.	WWJ	950	Toledo, Ohio	WSPD	1370
Florence, S.C.	WOLS	1230	Washington, D.C.	WRC	980
Grand Rapids, Mich.	WOOD	1300	Winston-Salem, N.C.	WSJS	600
Greenville, S.C.	WFBC	1330	Zanesville, Ohio	WHIZ	1240

1:30 P.M. CENTRAL DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

Chicago, Ill.	WMAQ	670	Memphis, Tenn.	WMC	790
Fort Wayne, Ind.	WGL	1450			

12:30 P.M. CENTRAL STANDARD TIME

Amarillo, Texas	KGNC	1440	Mankato, Minn.	KYSM	1230
Birmingham, Ala.	WBRC	960	Milwaukee, Wis.	WTMJ	620
Bismarck, N.D.	KFYR	550	Minneapolis and		
Bristol, Tenn.	WOPI	1490	St. Paul, Minn.	KSTP	1500
Duluth, Minn., and			New Orleans, La.	WSMB	1350
Superior, Wis.	WEBC	1320	Oklahoma City, Okla.	WKY	930
El Paso, Texas	KTSM	1380	Omaha, Neb.	WOW	590
Evansville, Ind.	WGBF	1280	Pittsburg, Kans.	KOAM	810
Fargo, N.D.	WDAY	970	Rochester, Minn.	KROC	1340
Hattiesburg, Miss.	WFOR	1400	St. Cloud, Minn.	KFAM	1450
Jackson, Miss.	WJDX	1300	St. Louis, Mo.	KSD	550
Kansas City, Mo.	WDAF	610	Shreveport, La.	KTBS	1480
Kingsport, Tenn.	WKPT	1400	Sioux Falls, S.D.	KSOO	1140
Laurel, Miss.	WAML	1340	Springfield, Mo.	KGBX	1260
Little Rock, Ark.	KARK	920	Terre Haute, Ind.	WBOW	1230
Louisville, Ky.	WAVE	970	Tulsa, Okla.	KVOO	1170
Madison, Wis.	WIBA	1310	Wichita, Kans.	KANS	1240

11:30 A.M. MOUNTAIN STANDARD TIME

Albuquerque, N.M.	KOB	1030	Phoenix, Ariz.	KTAR	620
Billings, Mont.	KGHL	790	Pocatello, Ida.	KSEI	930
Boise, Ida.	KIDO	1380	Safford, Ariz.	KGLV	1450
Bozeman, Mont.	KRBM	1450	Salt Lake City, Utah	KDYL	1320
Butte, Mont.	KGIR	1370	Tucson, Ariz.	KVOA	1290
Denver, Colo.	KOA	850	Twin Falls, Ida.	KTFI	1270
Helena, Mont.	KPFA	1240	Yuma, Arizona	KYUM	1240

10:30 A.M. PACIFIC STANDARD TIME

Fresno, Cal.	KMJ	580	San Francisco, Cal.	KPO	680
Los Angeles, Cal.	KFI	640	Seattle, Wash.	KOMO	950
Medford, Ore.	KMED	1440	Spokane, Wash.	KHQ	590
Portland, Ore.	KGW	620			

STATION CARRYING ROUND TABLE BY TRANSCRIPTION

Honolulu, T.H. KGU 760

Anticipating an important development in national affairs this week the University of Chicago Round Table will make last-minute arrangements for Sunday's broadcast

•

APRIL 27, 1941

PRINTED IN U.S.A.